



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,686	12/13/2001	Vildana Jahic	0070450-0024	9567
23600	7590	09/21/2004	EXAMINER	
COUDERT BROTHERS LLP 333 SOUTH HOPE STREET 23RD FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90071			ROY, SIKHA	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2879

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/017,686	JAHIC, VILDANA	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Sikha Roy	2879	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 November 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

The Amendment, filed on November 25, 2003 has been entered and is acknowledged by the Examiner.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,196,298 to Shaw.

Referring to claim 1 Shaw discloses (Fig. 4 column 2 lines 12-22,64-66, column 3 lines 5-11) a lamp 18 comprising bulb (body portion) 18A and a heat sink 10 comprising a cylindrical core 12 of copper with array of heat dissipating fins 14 circumferentially adjacent to the lower portion of the bulb.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,567,397 to Wilhelm et al.

Regarding claim 1 Wilhelm discloses (Figs. 1 and 3, column 3 lines 13-15 column 4 lines 1-11) an incandescent lamp comprising a bulb (envelope) 1 and a sleeve 9 made of brass circumferentially adjacent to the lower portion (sleeve 9 abuts at its open end against the lamp envelope) of the bulb. It is well known in the art that brass is a material of relatively high thermal conductivity and hence the sleeve surrounding the lower portion of the bulb inherently acts as heat sink.

Referring to claims 2 and 3, Wilhelm discloses (column 3 lines 13-15) the metal sleeve can be comprised of brass, which may be plated with nickel.

Regarding claim 4 Wilhelm discloses (column 4 lines 3-8) the pinched portion 2 of the bulb is inserted into the sleeve with a clamping fit.

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,280,061 to Kokado.

Referring to claim 6 Kokado discloses (Figs. 1,2 column 3 lines 43-67, column 5 lines 5-12)a halogen lamp assembly comprising a light-emitting bulb, a support 4 made of metal plate such as brass circumferentially adjacent to the lower portion of the bulb (insertion hole 4d reaches the bulb section) and a reflector 2 coupled to the support 4. It is well known in the art that brass is a material of relatively high thermal conductivity and hence the support 4 inherently acts as heat sink.

Regarding claim 7 Kokado discloses notches (reflector abutting pieces) 4a to attach the heat sink (support 4) to the reflector 2.

Regarding claim 8 Kokado discloses (column 3 lines 66,67) the heat sink 4 comprising of metal.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,567,397 to Wilhelm et al.

Claim 5 differs from Wilhelm in that Wilhelm does not exemplify the sleeve coupled to the bulb via adhesive cement.

It is well known in the art to use adhesive cement as attaching means for coupling the sleeve to the bulb (as is disclosed by Wilhelm column 1 lines 37,38). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to couple the metal sleeve with the bulb using adhesive cement.

Claims 6, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,567,397 to Wilhelm et al. further in view of U.S. Patent 5,466,981 to Fields et al.

Claim 6 differs from Wilhelm in that Wilhelm does not exemplify a reflector coupled to the heat sink of the lamp.

Fields in analogous art of reflector lamp discloses (column 2 lines 23-31) that light source is mounted inside a reflector to produce a reflector lamp with increased light

output intensity and improved control of beam distribution. Increased efficiency and control of beam distribution results in reduced power requirements in all applications.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a reflector coupled to the heat sink of Wilhelm as taught by Fields for increasing light output intensity and improving control of beam distribution.

Regarding claim 8 Wilhelm discloses the heat sink (sleeve) formed of metal.

Regarding claim 9 Wilhelm discloses the heat sink formed of brass plated with nickel.

Claims 7,10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,567,397 to Wilhelm et al. and U.S. Patent 5,466,981 to Fields et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,403,276 to Blaisdell.

Regarding claim 7, Wilhelm and Fields do not disclose the heat sink including a notch to attach it to the reflector.

Blaisdell in relevant art of projection lamp in a reflector unit discloses (Fig. 2 column 5 lines 1-20) a retention means 51 comprising notch (depressible spring) 53 secured to the sleeve 31 to attach the sleeve to the reflector. Blaisdell notes that this configuration prevents any displacement of the sleeve attached to the reflector from its desired position.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include notch as suggested by Blaisdell in the heat sink of the lamp assembly of Wilhelm and Fields for preventing any displacement of the heat sink attached to the reflector from its desired position.

Claims 10 and 11 essentially recite the same limitation as of claims 4 and 5 respectively and hence are rejected for the same reason (see rejection of claims 4 and 5).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed November 25, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the argument that sleeve in Wilhelm is not a heat sink to lower the temperature of the bulb, examiner respectfully submits that Wilhelm discloses the sleeve made of plated metal such as brass which is known in the art to be of relatively high thermal conductivity and hence inherently acts as heat sink lowering the temperature of the bulb.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. Patent 5,331,529 to Huang, U.S. Patent 4,885,668 to Maglica et al. and FR 2521779 to Krzenziess disclose heat sink portion for dispersing heat produced by a lamp. U.S. Patent 6,439,888 to Boutoussov et al. discloses brass having high thermal conductivity is suitable for heat sink member.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

### ***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sikha Roy whose telephone number is (571) 272-2463. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization is (703) 308-7382.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

  
Sikha Roy  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2879